

## EDITORIAL

### OUR 2000+ POLICY

*Folia Malacologica* was founded in 1987 [for the history of *Folia* see Editorial in *Folia Malacologica* 6(1–4): 5, for the history of the Association of Polish Malacologists and *Folia* see *Folia Malacologica* 7(4): 275–291]. Its hard times – no funds and hence no new volumes – fell on 1994–1997. It was resurrected in 1998, and it looked different then, and almost everybody liked its new looks. There was a problem, however: just during the anabiosis period of the *Folia* (1994–1997) the situation of zoological journals (and all other scientific journals as well) had changed dramatically, the changes being even more pronounced in the post-communistic countries. Like RIP VAN WINKLE, *Folia Malacologica* woke up to face a new reality, of which, luckily, the new EDITORIAL BOARD was fully aware. Where previously universities had financed journals of any sort, now they refused to finance them for... financial reasons. Where previously everybody could place almost everything on their publication list, as long as the list was long, now the lists were scrutinized for Current Contents, Citation Index, Impact Factor and later for Philadelphia List. Where previously journals had been generously sponsored by the State Committee for Scientific Research for the sole reason that they were there, now they faced the same problem as authors did: no Philadelphia List, no money. It was difficult for and somewhat hazardous of us to attempt resurrecting the journal in the midst of such a tempestuous period. Nonetheless, for the time being we have succeeded. Two questions arise: Why have we succeeded? What do we do next?

The answer to question one is simple. We have succeeded because the new image of the journal was nicer, because there still were authors looking for a place where to publish, because we accepted everything, as long as the presented data were decent and the reasoning sound, no matter what kind of paper it was: evolutionary, faunistic, ecological etc., and how small and insignificant the problem dealt with. Sometimes we even coaxed, tempted, pressed, pushed, cajoled, persuaded, threatened, blackmailed or literally begged the author to change this or that. Though we have only succeeded in terms of staying on the surface of the scientific soup and being able to scrape off

manuscripts enough for one fascicle in 1998 and four in 1999, it is quite a good start.

Now the situation of the journal has changed, but the external pressure has not. There is no shortage of authors and manuscripts (and no excess either), but all those horrible Committees, Factors and Lists are still looming ahead of us. For a year or so we will keep accepting all that is sound and decently written. But the number of papers submitted will keep increasing, or at least we hope so. What will our policy be in, say, 2002?

We are not going to change the scope, or focus. We will still deal with all aspects of malacology. Likewise, no priority will be given to anybody just because they are members of the Association, or because they are Polish, or because they are our aunts, or bosom friends, or anything else. Any aspect of structure, habits, physiology or classification of a clam, snail, squid, chiton etc., described by a malacologist of any race, creed, sex, age and affiliation, will be welcome. It is just that the more manuscripts we receive, the longer the queue will get, the more powerful magnifying glass our referees will use, the less lenient the editors will be, and the more illuminating the papers will have to become. Those who fall in a referee's disgrace, or produce relatively trivial results and somewhat careless reasoning, will not be pampered by the editors; they will have to revise their manuscripts endlessly and join the end of the queue again and again.

We may not like Miss Philadelphia List waltzing gracefully onto the stage in Mr. Impact Factor's strong arms. Like them or not, once we have decided to play bridge, we can not suddenly switch to the rules of poker among all those innumerable bridge players. This is necessity. But remember: the relation between the critical Miss Philadelphia List and the opinionated Mr. Impact Factor on one hand, and us on the other, is mutual: they are making us as much as we are making them. And, one last thing: we can speak scornfully of a place only after we have got there! To scorn a place before we have even got there and seen it, is ungentlemanly. Sic!

With the very best wishes for the Malacological Year 2000 (and may you never have to re-join the end of the queue),

EDITORS